

9th October 1928]

Ayes—cont.

- | | |
|---|---|
| 15. Syed Tajudin Sahib Bahadur. | 40. Rao Sahib R. Srinivasan. |
| 16. Mr. J. A. Davis. | 41. Khan Bahadur P. Khalifullah Sahib Bahadur. |
| 17. „ R. Foulkes. | 42. Mr. G. R. Premayya. |
| 18. „ P. J. Gnanavaram Pillai. | 43. Diwan Bahadur R. N. Arogyaswami Mudaliyar. |
| 19. Mahmud Sehamnad Sahib Bahadur. | 44. Mr. Ramanath Goenka. |
| 20. Mr. Muppil Nayar of Kavalappara. | 45. „ R. Nagan Gowda. |
| 21. „ J. Kuppuswami. | 46. The Zamindar of Gollapalli. |
| 22. Subadar-Major S. A. Nanjappa Bahadur. | 47. Mr. C. R. Parthasarathi Ayyangar. |
| 23. Rao Bahadur O. M. Narayanan Nambudirtpad. | 48. „ T. C. Srinivasa Ayyangar. |
| 24. Mr. K. Krishnan. | 49. „ P. Siva Rao. |
| 25. „ N. Siva Raj. | 50. „ Chavadi K. Subrahmanya Pillai. |
| 26. „ M. V. Gangadhara Siva. | 51. „ K. R. Venkatarama Ayyar. |
| 27. Rao Sahib L. C. Guruswami. | 52. „ K. P. Raman Menon. |
| 28. Mr. V. I. Muniswami Pillai. | 53. Rao Bahadur C. S. Ratnasabapathi Mudaliyar. |
| 29. „ W. P. A. Soundara Pandia Nadar. | 54. The Raja of Panagal. |
| 30. „ S. Subrahmanya Moopnar. | 55. Rao Bahadur Sir A. P. Patro. |
| 31. „ Daniel Thomas. | 56. Mr. T. K. Chidambaramatha Mudaliyar. |
| 32. „ S. V. Vanavudaya Goundar. | 57. Khadir Mohideen Sahib Bahadur. |
| 33. Nattam Dubash Kadir Sahib Syed Ibrahim Sahib Bahadur. | 58. Diwan Bahadur S. Kumaraswami Reddiyar. |
| 34. Rai Sahib M. Hampayya. | 59. Rao Bahadur B. Muniswami Nayudu. |
| 35. The Zamindar of Singampatti. | 60. The Zamindar of Mirzapuram. |
| 36. Mr. C. R. T. Congreve. | 61. Mr. A. V. Bhanoji Rao. |
| 37. Rajkumar S. N. Dorai Raja. | |
| 38. Mr. S. Arpudaswami Udayar. | |
| 39. The Zamindar of Kallikota. | |

Noes.

- | | |
|-----------------------------------|------------------------------------|
| 1. Mr. Sami Venkatachalam Chetti. | 15. Mr. K. R. Karant. |
| 2. „ S. Satyamurti. | 16. „ C. Obi Reddi. |
| 3. „ C. V. Venkataramana Ayyangar | 17. „ A. Parasurama Rao. |
| 4. „ T. Adinarayana Chettiyar. | 18. „ C. Ramasomayajulu. |
| 5. „ P. Anjaneyulu. | 19. „ Basheer Ahmad Sayeed Sahib. |
| 6. „ P. C. Venkatapathi Raja. | 20. „ P. Bhaktavatsulu Nayudu. |
| 7. „ J. A. Saldanha. | 21. Sriman Biswanath Das Mahasayo. |
| 8. „ Abdul Hamid Khan. | 22. Mr. A. Kaleswara Rao. |
| 9. „ C. S. Govindaraja Mudaliyar. | 23. „ R. Srinivasa Ayyangar. |
| 10. „ G. Harisarvottama Rao. | 24. „ K. Koti Reddi. |
| 11. „ C. N. Muthuranga Mudaliyar. | 25. „ L. K. Tulasiram. |
| 12. „ K. V. R. Swami. | 26. „ K. V. Krishnaswami Nayakar. |
| 13. „ M. Narayana Raju. | 27. „ C. Venkataramam Nayudu. |
| 14. „ K. Uppi Sahib. | 28. „ B. Venkataratnam. |

Ayes 61. Noes 28.

The motion was carried.

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—“I appoint Mr. T. C. Srinivasa Ayyangar as the Chairman of the Select Committee.”

IV

A BILL TO AMEND THE MADRAS UNIVERSITY ACT, 1923.

The hon. Dr. P. SUBBARAYAN :—“Mr. President, I now present the report of the Select Committee of the Madras University Amendment Act and move that it be considered by this Council.”

The hon. Mr. S. MUTHIAH MUDALIYAR :—“I second it.”

The motion was put and carried.

* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—“Clause 1 is for the consideration of the Council.”

[9th October 1928]

The hon. Dr. P. SUBBARAYAN :—" I move, Sir,

for the figures ' 1927 ' in the second line of clause 1, the figures ' 1928 ' be substituted.

(After a pause.) The hon. Mr. S. MUTHIAH MUDALIYAR :—" I second it."

* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—" I think it is better that the Government make arrangements to have their amendments promptly seconded."

The amendment was put and carried.

Clause 1 as amended was then put, passed and added to the Bill.

Clause 2.

The hon. Dr. P. SUBBARAYAN :—" I move, Sir,

' In sub-clause (i) in line 4 for the words ' are provided ' substitute the words ' provision is made for ; and, in line 6, for the word ' degree ' substitute the word ' degrees '.

" This, Sir, is a consequential amendment."

The hon. Mr. S. MUTHIAH MUDALIYAR :—" I second it."

The amendment was put and carried.

The hon. Dr. P. SUBBARAYAN :—" I move : In sub-clause (ii) in line 5, after the word ' notification ' insert the words and figures ' dated 20th August 1904.' In line 7, for the word ' less ' substitute the word ' excluding.' In line 8, for the words ' might be ' substitute the words ' have been or may be.' In line 11, for the word ' providing ' substitute the words ' in which provision is made for.' In line 12, for the word ' preparing ' substitute the words ' for the preparation of ; ' and in line 13, after the word ' University ' insert the words ' in such learning.' These again, Mr. President, are consequential and verbal amendments."

The hon. Mr. S. MUTHIAH MUDALIYAR :—" I second it."

The amendments were put and carried.

The hon. Dr. P. SUBBARAYAN :—" In sub-clause (iv) in lines 3 to 5, for the words ' (gg) ' Professional College ' . . . University ; ' substitute the words ' (gg) Professional College means a college in which provision is made for, either solely or in conjunction with other courses of study, courses of study leading up to the professional degrees of the University.'

" This is also a consequential amendment, Sir."

The hon. Mr. S. MUTHIAH MUDALIYAR :—" I second it."

12 noon. * Mr. S. SATYAMURTI :—" Sir, I expect the hon. Minister to throw some light on this matter. Anyhow, the English of it is very inartistic and inelegant, and I don't want the precedent of the old Act to be repeated when we are re-enacting in English the old Act. If hon. Members will kindly read the definition it runs as follows :—

' Professional college means a college in which provision is made for, either solely or in conjunction with other courses of study, courses of study leading up to the professional degrees of the University.'

" I do hope that the hon. Minister will give his students and the members of the University better English than this. It can be easily done. For one thing, the preposition ' for ' is followed by a long intervening phrase which really obscures the meaning. Secondly the phrase ' courses of study ' is

9th October 1928]

[Mr. S. Satyamurti]

repeated twice only, with a comma between. It is very inartistic and inelegant. The Bill, as amended by the Select Committee, has this definition—

‘Professional college means a college in which are provided courses of study leading up to the professional degrees of the university.’

“I do not see what is wrong with that definition. The hon. Minister has not told us either. Does the hon. Minister think that if in a professional college there are other courses of study prescribed it will cease to be a professional college? His fear is absolutely groundless. So long as a college satisfies the condition that it provides for the professional degrees of the university, whether any other courses of study are prescribed or not in the college it does not matter, and it will still be called a professional college. The definition already provided in the Bill is quite sufficient, unless the hon. Minister gives us reasons which he has so far not given, to show that the definition should be changed. I would submit to the House to reject the amendment or ask the hon. Minister to withdraw the amendment and leave the clause exactly as it stands.”

Mr. S. ARPUDASWAMI UDAYAR :—“Sir, may I move that the word ‘for’ in the second line be omitted and the word ‘for’ in the last but one line be retained.”

* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—“The hon. Member will not be in order; I have not had notice of the amendment.”

The hon. Dr. P. SUBBARAYAN :—“In view of the remarks of the hon. Member for the University, I do not press the amendment.”

The amendment was by leave withdrawn.

Clause 2 as amended was put, passed and added to the Bill.

Clause 3.

* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—“The question is that clause 3 stand part of the Bill.”

* Mr. J. A. SALDANHA :—“I oppose this clause which does away with the Council of Affiliated Colleges. The Act of 1923 was passed with some definite object as stated in the preamble and one of the objects is this :

‘And whereas it is desirable by the concentration and co-ordination of resources for higher teaching and research at suitable centres outside the limits of the university to prepare for the institution of new universities . . .’

“Distinction was also made between constituent colleges and affiliated colleges. This Bill wants to do away with the main objects of the Act of 1923. This Act has hardly been in operation for five years and now we are asked to do away with one main object of the Act, namely, the formation of university centres. The very definition of ‘university centre’ was omitted in the original Bill, and it was due to the strenuous efforts of Sir Patro and my humble self that this definition of university centre was inserted in the Bill. The Council of Affiliated Colleges was formed with a view to carry out one of the main objects of the Act. It was formed on the recommendation of the Sadler Committee. They recommended that in addition to the other bodies of the university there should be a Council of Affiliated Colleges and that certain definite powers should be given to that

[Mr. J. A. Saldanha]

[9th October 1928]

body. Certain powers were clearly given to that body under section 27. I do not want to dwell on all the powers of the Council of Affiliated Colleges. One of them is to recommend to the Local Government through the Syndicate as to the financial provision that is to be made to the Affiliated Colleges. The other is in connexion with the Affiliated Colleges Fund mentioned in section 51. The control of the fund is given to this body. Now, Sir, it is stated in the Statement of Objects and Reasons that this body has been a clog in the wheel of the university and that this ought to be abolished. May I ask whether any opportunity was given to the Council of Affiliated Colleges to do its function? Was a fund constituted for the Affiliated Colleges? Did the Government provide funds for this purpose? Without the sinews of war, what is the use of having a body like the Council of Affiliated Colleges? Did Government provide funds for the fostering of university life in the mufassal? There are many colleges in the mufassal which in point of efficiency are quite as good as any college in the Presidency town. Having been given no opportunity either by the Senate or the Syndicate or the Government, is it fair to charge it as being a clog in the wheel, as obstructive and so on? It is worse than unfair. I have already given an amendment to this clause stating that the Council of Affiliated Colleges should be retained and that it should be invested with larger powers to do the functions assigned to it under the Act. The affiliated colleges contribute more than two-thirds of the funds of the university and more than two-thirds of the students read in the affiliated colleges. Thus they do so much to foster university life in the country. And yet this important limb of the university is sought to be abolished on flimsy grounds and the reasons given by the hon. Minister in his speech and in his Statement of Objects and Reasons are very unreasonable. The Senate which represents the expert view of the question has after careful consideration resolved to retain this body, and we must respect the opinion of the Senate. I appeal to the Council to retain the Council of Affiliated Colleges and give it ample powers, so that it may help to foster the development of university life in the mufassal. I want to know in what way the constituent colleges have helped more the development of university life. We have got the constituent colleges in Madras, and what have they done in the matter of inter-collegiate unions and university unions and such other matters as in the European universities? The old Act which created the Council of Affiliated Colleges was passed by the then Ministry with such a tremendous enthusiasm, and why should it not be allowed to work for another five years? I appeal to the House to retain the Council of Affiliated Colleges for at least another five years.

12-15
p.m.

"Without giving this Council of Affiliated Colleges an opportunity, is it fair, Sir, that this Council should be abolished? I can give hon. Members many more reasons. But I will not detain hon. Members by a longer speech. My only appeal is that this question will not be treated as a party one, because it is not a party question at all. Mufassal colleges must have a separate Council; it will foster university life and bring about the existence of more universities."

*Rajkumar S. N. DORAI RAJA:—"Mr. President, Sir, I rise to second the motion moved by my hon. Friend, Mr. Saldanha . . ."

*The hon. the PRESIDENT:—"He has not moved any amendment. He is opposing clause 3 of the Bill."

9th October 1928]

* **Rajkumar S. N. DORAI RAJA** :—“ Yes, Sir. The burden of the song of the two University Bills is that the Council of Affiliated Colleges must go. It is stated that the Council of Affiliated Colleges had not done anything very useful. The most useful body and the least complicated body is the Council of Affiliated Colleges. So long as the chief function of the Madras University is the affiliation of colleges, so long it is absolutely necessary, apart from justice and equity, that we should not abolish the Council of Affiliated Colleges.

“ No serious attempt has been made to change the angle of vision of the Madras University. The burden of the song of these two Bills is that the Council of Affiliated Colleges must go. Restore it and these Bills are innocuous. The Senate has been reduced to a second rate body and the Syndicate's powers were enhanced, and we are seriously asked to vote for these Bills. Only the other day I read an amusing telegram with regard to the Ettayapuram Zamindar, “ Our Maharaja has been made Raja; congratulations to the Raja.” So, Sir, the Senate and the Council of Affiliated Colleges are practically dead and we are asked to congratulate the authors of these Bills.

“ There is another difficulty for myself. I cannot understand the mentality or the mental reservations of those who say that this Council should be abolished. It is a question of the mufassal versus Madras. I do not want to refer to that point. There are hon. Members, especially my hon. Friend, the Member for the University, who will come down upon me for the insinuation. I am prepared for it. Whenever there is the question of Madras against mufassal, Madras stands to gain. I shall give you an instance. When Sir Patro and my humble self said at the time of the Select Committee meeting that a fund ought to be created for affiliated colleges, there was great opposition, and Dr. Meston and others wanted also to include the constituent colleges. So you see, Sir, that the bubble of impartiality was burst and it vanished into thin air.”

Mr. P. ANJANEYULU :—“ Mr. President, Sir, I support the amendment of my hon. Friend, Mr. Saldanha . . . ”

The hon. the **PRESIDENT** :—“ The hon. Member, Mr. Saldanha, has not moved any amendment. He is opposing clause 3.”

Mr. P. ANJANEYULU :—“ I also say that the words ‘ the Council of Affiliated Colleges ’ should not be omitted. Affiliated colleges form practically the ramification and the limbs of university life in the mufassal. If only proper opportunities are afforded to the affiliated colleges, if the Council of Affiliated Colleges is allowed to function properly, and if funds are placed at their disposal, I am perfectly sure that these possess all the germs which will, in future, develop into definite university centres themselves. In this vast country, concentration in special education may not always be possible. As my hon. Friend, Mr. Dorai Raja, put it, it seems to me that the Madras University neglects the mufassal. Mufassal colleges are already very much handicapped, and the Council of Affiliated Colleges must be retained for the purposes which were mentioned at the time when the Bill became an Act last time. The same matter was discussed at great length both in the Senate and when the Andhra University Bill was on the anvil of the Legislative Council. The Council of Affiliated Colleges would fulfil the function of imparting education in the mufassal to an extent which even the Madras or

[Mr. P. Anjaneyulu]

[9th October 1928]

the metropolitan colleges may not be able to do. They have a history and past of their own. It is not fair that the Council of Affiliated Colleges should, after a period of its existence, be removed from the statute now. I therefore oppose the clause."

* Mr. S. SATYAMURTI:—"Sir, it is very easy for the question being converted into the question of mufassal versus Madras. But I do not think it is. In spite of the attempt of my hon. Friend from Pudukkottah, I hope the House will not imagine that those who oppose and those who support the retention of this clause in the Bill are actuated by any feelings of Madras versus mufassal or the mufassal versus Madras. Sir, the real point is this. The University of Madras, as it is to-day constituted, is very largely a mufassal university and no man who cares for the future well-being of the university, as it is to-day, would like to take any step or would like to be a party to a step which will affect prejudicially or adversely the position of the mufassal or the affiliated colleges as they are known under the scheme of the University Act. But, Sir, this Council of Affiliated Colleges—I mean no offence to the members thereof—is a mere ornamental addition which has no powers whatever worth mentioning, and which has never exercised any functions or powers useful for the mufassal colleges as such. I am not suggesting for one moment that, if they were given real substantial powers, and if it were possible to reconcile those powers with the powers of the Academic Council and of the Senate on the other, it may not be possible to evolve a council which may fulfil some important functions with regard to mufassal colleges. But to those friends who think on those lines, I want to put only one question. Do we not know too much of the defects of diarchy here to try to plant it elsewhere? The whole scheme of the Academic Council on the one hand and the Council of Affiliated Colleges on the other is to create a kind of diarchy, and to say that the Academic Council will be the Reserved Half and that the Council of the Affiliated Colleges will be the Transferred Half. The Academic Council will have all powers, but the Council of Affiliated Colleges will have merely the semblance of powers; and five years have shown us that the interests of the affiliated colleges are absolutely safe in the hands of the Academic Council, in the hands of the Senate and, may I add, in the hands of the Syndicate. (One voice:—Question.) To my hon. Friend from Pudukkottah who said that the Syndicate was selfish or that the Syndicate is believed to be selfish, I would ask him respectfully to descend from the realm of speculation to the realm of facts, and to give a single instance to us where the interests of any mufassal college were sacrificed, either wholly or partially to the interests of any Madras college. That is an accusation, Sir, which I am prepared to deny as totally untrue. It is not true that the Syndicate or the Senate or the Academic Council has ever tried to differentiate between mufassal and Madras colleges. There is no reason for any such fear. But assuming for one moment, Mr. President, that there may be any such fear, may I invite your attention and that of my hon. Friends respectfully to section 27 of the existing Act, which we are now seeking to amend, which defines the powers of the Council of Affiliated Colleges? What are those powers? (a) To make proposals to the Syndicate or the Academic Council. Surely, not a power; it is a mere recommendatory power to make proposals to other bodies; (b) to appoint an executive committee of itself with no powers; the executive committee can have no more powers than the powers of the appointing authority; (c) to advise the Syndicate and the Academic Council on any matter affecting

9th October 1928]

[Mr. S. Satyamurti]

affiliated colleges; advice is no power; (d) to submit draft regulations and ordinances to the Academic Council or to the Syndicate as the case may be; submission of drafts is no power; (e) to advise the Syndicate on the affiliation of any institution; advice is no power; (f) to arrange in consultation with the colleges concerned for co-operation and reciprocity among affiliated colleges and for the concentration and co-ordination of resources for higher teaching in suitable localities, etc."

Mr. ABDUL HAMID KHAN:—"What about the Academic Council?"

* Mr. S. SATYAMURTI:—"Kindly read the Act."

* Mr. ABDUL HAMID KHAN:—"I have read it."

* Mr. S. SATYAMURTI:—" (g) To make proposals to the Local Government; again making proposals; (h) to recommend names; (i) to advise the Academic Council. May I ask whether any body which has any of these or all these powers can be said to have any powers worth mentioning? It seems to me, Sir, that the creation of the Council of Affiliated Colleges was intended merely to satisfy sentiment. Five years' experience has shown to us that this Council has served and will serve no useful purpose. May I point out to you, Mr. President, that the last meeting of the Council of the Affiliated Colleges lasted for seven minutes? There was no agenda worth mentioning; one affiliation matter and one recommendation. The Council met and dispersed. Why do you want to keep on an ornamental body like that? But the representation of mufassal interests, if I may use that phrase on the university bodies, must be protected. Therefore, I want to provide for the representation of affiliated colleges on the Senate by ten elected representatives, and on the Syndicate by three elected representatives. I am as zealous as any hon. Member here that this statutory representation of the mufassal colleges ought to be preserved intact. The scheme of the Bill as amended by the Select Committee is that there shall be representation of mufassal colleges on the Syndicate as also on the Academic Council. So far as the Syndicate is concerned, the Select Committee Bill makes a provision for the representation of the Senate on the Syndicate which is eight members, of whom three members shall be teachers of affiliated colleges. Whereas, I have given notice of an amendment that the representation of the Senate on the Syndicate shall continue to be eight, but that the representation now provided for the Council of Affiliated Colleges on the Syndicate shall be continued by increasing the number of representatives of the Academic Council or the Syndicate from three to six and providing that three of these shall be teachers in affiliated colleges. The Academic Council, as you will notice, Sir, is a body largely consisting of teachers. Therefore, I submit that that is the appropriate electorate to get the teachers elected who have got the largest number of votes of the largest number of teachers in the mufassal colleges. Both under the scheme of the Select Committee Bill and under the scheme of the amendments of which I have given notice, the representation of the teachers of affiliated colleges on the Syndicate will remain unimpaired. So far as the representation of mufassal colleges on the Senate is concerned, the Select Committee Bill provides that the representation shall be by ten from the Academic Council of whom five shall be teachers of affiliated colleges. On the other hand, I have given notice of an amendment preserving the present number of ten by providing that the number of members to be elected by the Academic Council to the Senate shall be twenty, of whom ten shall

[Mr. S. Satyamurti]

[9th October 1928]

be teachers in affiliated colleges. Therefore, with these amendments the representation of the interests represented by the teachers of affiliated colleges will be exactly as it is to-day.

12-30 P.m. “Moreover, when these mufassal colleges get stronger representation on the Academic Council and on the Senate as is provided in this Bill, you will find that the mufassal colleges will be in a much better position than they are to-day. This is very simple, Sir. Would hon. Members like to be members even completely of a powerless body, or would they like to be in an effective minority or a powerful body whereby their presence, by their influence and by their speeches, they can help to shape the decisions which will be binding on the university authorities? Of course, my hon. Friends may say that it is better to reign in Hell than serve in Heaven; I do not want to say anything on that aspect. But to those who represent mufassal colleges and their interests and want to have effective power in the shaping of the effective decisions of university authorities, I would say, I invite them respectfully to look at this side of the case, viz., that the amendments provide for effective unreduced representation of the mufassal colleges, both on the Academic Council and on the Syndicate.

“Sir, I was somewhat surprised at the attitude of my hon. Friend from Pudukkottah; because when I read his dissenting minute carefully, I found that while he justified the retention in a particular form of an old clause of the Bill, he has said nothing in favour of the retention of the Council of Affiliated Colleges. He has signed the report in conjunction with my hon. and distinguished Friend, the author of the old Madras University Act, and therefore it cannot be a case of omission or neglect. I do not want to quarrel with my Friend on that account, but I only want to impress on this House that the Select Committee is unanimous, except for my hon. Friend from South Kanara, on this matter. No other member has raised any question with regard to the abolition of the Council of Affiliated Colleges. I only want to add that it is not a case of mufassal versus Madras. I am representing in this Council a constituency, the vast bulk of whom are in the mufassal and are connected with mufassal colleges, directly or indirectly. I have thought over this matter very carefully. It is because I believe that the mufassal colleges will for the first time come by their own and exercise the undoubted influence to which they are entitled, in the affairs of the university by allowing this make-shift of a Council of Affiliated Colleges to go—which serves nobody except mere sentiment—and by taking their rightful share in the shaping of the university affairs, that I ask the House to accept the retention of the clause as it stands. I only desire to add, as a mere matter of drafting, that the carrying or the failure to carry this amendment will not affect the existence or otherwise of the Council of Affiliated Colleges. Hon. Members will notice that the clause which this seeks to amend simply says that ‘the first Chancellor, Pro-Chancellor and Vice-Chancellor of the University and the first members of the Senate, the Syndicate, the Academic Council and the Council of Affiliated Colleges and all persons who may hereafter become such officers or members so long as they continue to hold such office or membership are hereby constituted a body corporate by the name of the University of Madras.’ But it says ‘hereafter.’ Anyhow, that is a mere drafting point. I do not want to attach undue importance to it.

“I want the House to vote on this question in the full consciousness that the interests of the mufassal colleges have not been and cannot be served by

9th October 1928]

[Mr. S. Satyamurti]

this powerless Council, but will be better served by the increased representation provided for them in the Bill, as also under my amendment which I invite the House in advance to support, by means of which they may get adequate representation on the really effective bodies of the university."

* Mr. W. E. SMITH:—"Mr. President, while I am a member of one of the Madras Colleges and I have the privilege to be an elected member of the Council of Affiliated Colleges, I know the relationship subsisting between the General Academic Council and the various other bodies in the university, and believe that there is general agreement in academic circles that the Council of Affiliated Colleges is serving no useful academic purpose. I may even go so far as to say the Act of 1923 never anticipated that this Council of Affiliated Colleges should be a source of antagonism as it shows signs of becoming between the Madras colleges and the mufassal colleges. But this antagonism will, I am afraid, continue to exist so long as the Council of Affiliated Colleges exists. As Mr. Satyamurti has pointed out, the powers of this Council are only advisory, and there is no power of initiative now vested in it which is proposed to be taken away."

"I should like to make it clear in this connexion—and I think I can command the confidence of the House when I say that—that in the proposed Bill, the mufassal colleges will have greater representation in the Syndicate, the Academic Council, etc., than they have at present."

* Mr. F. E. CORLEY:—"I should just like to add a few words to what Mr. Smith has already put forward. I think it is a real privilege to be a member of this Council of Affiliated Colleges; but I should like to remind the House of a point which seems to me to be important in considering the question, viz., what was the genesis of this body. Those members who may have seen the earlier drafts out of which the Madras University Act itself was evolved eventually, may remember that the one feature of the proposal, which was strongly advocated by some and strongly opposed by some others, was to draw a sharp distinction between the Madras colleges and the colleges in the mufassal. The idea at that time was to take the colleges which were within a convenient distance from Fort St. George, viz., ten miles, and to develop them and them alone into something centralized. Whether this was to become a residential and teaching university was a question left to be decided later on; but the distinction which was then made between the constituent and affiliated colleges still exists. The original intention was nothing other than that the constituent colleges should be really represented on the Councils of the University. Now, had it been possible to provide for the mufassal colleges also in a similar fashion, allowing them to develop in due course as universities at suitable centres, thereby relieving Madras of its responsibility for the conduct of the colleges at a distance, there would have been no reason why the Madras University Act should not have retained this limitation allowing no colleges to have any part in it except those which were in Madras itself. But unfortunately, it was quite obvious as a matter of practical politics that it would not be possible to dispose of the colleges in the mufassal by the happy device of turning them in similar fashion, at an early date, into new universities. If the Madras colleges alone were to be converted into a University in which these mufassal colleges would have no share, but if they could not be detached from the Madras university to form separate universities of their own, it was thought that they would then be in a very unenviable position. We should all agree,

[Mr. F. E. Corley]

[9th October 1928]

whether we belong to Madras or to the mufassal, that such a position would be intolerable. If I really thought that the affiliated colleges depended upon this Council of Affiliated Colleges to protect their interests, I would not stir even a finger in the direction of disturbing the present arrangement and deleting this clause. But, as I said, there is another safeguard in all the drafts so far prepared and in the present Bill, to provide for the interests of the mufassal colleges and to secure the possibility of their development in course of time. At a later stage clauses were introduced giving the mufassal colleges representation in the Senate and in the Syndicate; they were also given—and that is very relevant to the present point—representation on the same terms in the Academic Council as the Madras colleges.

“The hon. Member for South Kanara speaking just now insisted that the affiliated colleges must be looked after by a separate council. Sauce for the goose is sauce for the gander!”

12-45
p.m.

“If the affiliated colleges can only be adequately protected by a council set apart for their own rights, I say, Sir, by a parity of reasoning, the constituent colleges can only have their interests adequately looked after and protected by a council which represents constituent colleges and constituent colleges only. The idea of the authors of the Act was that the Academic Council should be entirely for the constituent colleges but when this purpose has been abandoned, and instead of being a council only of constituent colleges, it is made a council of all the colleges under the university constituent and affiliated, the Madras and mufassal colleges alike, I cannot see that there is any justification for the further protection by a separate council of affiliated colleges. It should be noted, Sir, that though the mufassal colleges individually are not quite in so good a position in the Academic Council as the Madras colleges, yet by reason of their much greater numbers, they are collectively stronger. I think I am right in saying that the mufassal members of the Academic Council considerably outnumber the Madras members, and if the working majority in the Academic Council cannot adequately protect the interests of the mufassal colleges, I am afraid they are helpless. But, as a matter of fact, whatever needs to be done on behalf of the mufassal colleges can be done most effectively in and through the academic council. As Mr. Satyamurti reminded us just now, at the last meeting of the Council of Affiliated Colleges they had so little to do that the whole business was finished in less than ten minutes. I think I am right in saying that one unfortunate member arriving late was met by members coming down the stairs as the business was all over. The truth is that the affiliated colleges are in no deed of protection in the Academic Council. For my part I can only say, it is, under present conditions, better so. They meet in the same way as the Madras colleges and it simplifies business and creates better feeling. Mufassal colleges are so well represented and looked after in the Academic Council that it is simply unnecessary, I think I may say also, unreasonable to provide a separate body for them.”

The question that clause 3 stand part of the Bill was put to the House and carried, and the clause was added to the Bill.

Clause 4.

* Mr. J. A. SALDANHA :—“I beg to move, Sir

“In lines 3 and 4, for the words “have the following powers” substitute the words “function and exercise through the Senate, the Academic Council, Council of Affiliated Colleges, the Senate”.”

9th October 1928]

* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—"The hon. Member will have to move his amendment with the words 'Council of Affiliated Colleges' omitted, because the House has given its vote for its abolition."

* Mr. J. A. SALDANHA :—"Yes, Sir, in lines 3 and 4, for the words 'have the following powers' *substitute* the words 'function and exercise through the Senate, the Academic Council, the Senate, the Faculties, the Boards of Studies, and such other bodies as may be declared by the statutes to be authorities of the University with powers hereafter entrusted with'."

* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—"The hon. Member will not be in order if he moves the amendment with the words 'Council of Affiliated Colleges'."

* Mr. J. A. SALDANHA :—"I have omitted the words, Sir, and I omit all the other sub-clauses of clause 4-A except No. (1). My reasons are these. This is altogether a new section to be added and it is quite superfluous as pointed out by the Senate and by several eminent authorities of the University that it would lead to any amount of confusion and trouble. We have found it in the Select Committee that it created a lot of confusion. What is the reason? The University as a body is a big corporate body and it consists of a number of other bodies. The powers of the different bodies are given, as, the Senate can exercise such and such powers, the Syndicate so and so as well as several other bodies. It will be a good thing if all these are defined clearly. It is merely a question of artistic wording of the Act. I don't find any other Act in which these powers are enumerated in one section. Therefore as a matter of mere wording and of artistic phraseology of the whole Act, simply say that the University shall exercise, etc. That will save us the unnecessary enumeration of the powers of the several bodies of the University."

* The hon. the PRESIDENT (after a pause) :—"There is no seconder and so the motion falls through."

Mr. K. R. VENKATARAMA AYYAR :—"I am only asking that in line 4 of sub-clause (4) for the word '*Lectureships*' the word '*Lecturerships*' be substituted. It is perhaps a misprint and whichever is the more correct word may be put in on the advice of the two experts."

* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—"Even if it is a question of the correct word, the hon. Member should move his motion."

Mr. K. R. VENKATARAMA AYYAR :—"I move that for the word '*Lectureships*', '*Lecturerships*' be substituted."

Rao Bahadur C. S. RATNASABHAPATHI MUDALIYAR :—"I second it."

* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—"The question is that in line 4 of sub-clause (4) for the word '*Lectureships*' *substitute* the word '*Lecturerships*'."

* Mr. W. E. SMITH :—"I think the word '*Lectureships*' is more elegant than '*Lecturerships*', nor is it suggested that the word '*Readerships*' should be substituted for '*Readerships*'."

* Mr. F. E. CORLEY :—"I venture to differ from my hon. Colleague. The word '*Lectureship*' is an easier word to say than '*Lecturership*', but I don't think it is more elegant. If we take '*Readership*' as an example, the word '*Reader*' shows that it is not an office and if we add a termination '*ship*' to it, it shows the office. I know there are ample precedents, but I am at one with the Mover that a change is desirable."

[9th October 1928]

The hon. Dr. P. SUBBARAYAN :—" I am at a loss to know what I have to say when I have two experts here and both of them differ ; but I have looked at the dictionary and I have also consulted the Law (Drafting) Department and from the drafting point of view, they say that 'Lectureship' is more correct than 'Lecturership'."

* Diwan Bahadur S. KUMARASWAMI REDDIYAR :—" In the original draft the word was 'Lecturership'. In the Select Committee the word 'lecture-ship' was introduced as one of the expert members considered that 'Lectureship' was better."

Mr. K. R. VENKATARAMA AYYAR :—" On the analogy of the word. . ."

* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—" The hon. Member has no right of making any speech. I have simply to put it to the vote of the House unless the hon. Member withdraws it."

The amendment was then put to the House and lost.

* Mr. BASHEER AHMED SAYEED SAHIB :—" I move, Sir, that the following sub-clauses be added at the end of clause 4 :—

(20) *To exercise due control over the quality of teaching given by the colleges which constitute the University or are affiliated to it.*

(21) *To foster the development of academic life and corporate unity as well in the colleges as in the University by so promoting co-operation among the colleges and between the University and the colleges as to utilize to the full the teaching resources available within the limits of the University.*

(22) *To accept bequests and transfers of movable or immovable properties made in favour of the University.*

" Mr. President, the reasons which moved me to include these three new clauses as additional powers to the University are that among the objects of the University it is mentioned in the preamble that with a view to establishing a teaching and residential university the function of the University is 'to continue to exercise due control over the quality of teaching given by colleges which are to constitute the University of Madras'; and also 'to foster the development of academic life' and so on. In order to enable the University to exercise these functions and to realize the objects stated in the preamble, it is quite necessary and reasonable that these powers should be specifically enumerated in the clauses relating to the powers of the University. Hence I move this amendment."

Sriman BISWANATH DAS Mahasaya :—" I second it, Sir."

The hon. Dr. P. SUBBARAYAN :—" Mr. President, as for sub-clauses (20) and (21) which my hon. Friend wants to-day, these are provided in the preamble to the old Act itself. Therefore I don't think it is necessary to repeat them in clause 4 ; and with regard to sub-clause (22), this is specifically mentioned as one of the powers of the Syndicate—*vide* clause 20 of the Bill. Clause 4 (19) also gives powers to the University as are desirable to further the objects of the University. It does not therefore appear to be necessary to include the proposed sub-clauses."

The amendment was put to the House and lost.

Clause 4 was put, passed and added to the Bill.

9th October 1928]

Clause 5.

The hon. Dr. P. SUBBARAYAN :—" Sir, I beg to move the following amendment—

"In lines 5 and 6, for the words "(ii) after the word 'religious' inserted" substitute the words "(ii) for the words 'relating to religious belief or profession' the words 'relating to religious belief or profession or political views' shall be substituted."

"Sir, this appears to be more elegant than what was put forward by the Select Committee. The main idea that actuated the Select Committee was that they did not want to penalise any religious or other belief, and this amendment equally carries out that idea."

Mr. S. SATYAMURTI :—" I second it."

The amendment was put to the vote and carried.

Clause 5 as amended was then put, passed and added to the Bill.

Clauses 6 to 10.

Clauses 6, 7, 8, 9 and 10 were then consecutively put, passed and added to the Bill.

Clause 11.

* Mr. BASHEER AHMAD SAYEED SAHIB :—" I move, Sir :

"In sub-section (1) of section 11 of the Act, for the words "may be paid such salary as shall be prescribed", substitute the words "the Senate shall decide at the commencement or end of every term of a Vice-Chancellor whether he should be a salaried or an honorary Vice-Chancellor, and if a salaried one what salary shall be paid to him".

"Sir, the reason for moving this amendment is to provide for the appointment of an honorary vice-chancellor whenever it is possible for the University to do so. As the Act stands at present, it is not possible for any honorary vice-chancellor being appointed because the provision made in the Act is that he shall be a salaried officer. Also, if there is any honorary vice-chancellor ready and willing to offer his services to the University, there is no provision made for either deciding the salary or not deciding upon the salary and for a limit thereof in the present Act. I have therefore provided, Sir, that in the Bill there should be powers given to the Senate to appoint honorary vice-chancellors if such people are available and also to fix the salary only whenever it is necessary for the Senate to fix any salary for the vice-chancellor. According to the old Act and the old constitution of the University, the vice-chancellors have always been honorary ones and they have rendered the University as efficient a service as the paid vice-chancellors. There is no dearth of honorary vice-chancellors in our Presidency, and it is always possible for the University to save a lot of money by enlisting the services of vice-chancellors who are honorary and who are willing to serve the University. I therefore say, Sir, that the Senate of the University should reserve the power of appointing honorary vice-chancellors, and also to fix their salaries as and whenever the occasion arises."

* Sriman BISWANATH DAS Mahasaya :—" I have very great pleasure, Sir, in seconding the motion of my hon. Friend. Sir, the University is an autonomous body and if I have read the amending Bill aright, it proceeds on the basis that the University shall be the sole legislative body so far as

[Sriman Biswanath Das Mahasayo] [9th October 1928]

giving effect to the provisions of the Act is concerned. It is a very enlightened body consisting of the elite of this province, and it is but fair that the power of fixing the pay of its chief executive officer should be given to it. This Council, under the Government of India Act, has practically got the power of appointing and fixing the salaries of Ministers. In the Calcutta Corporation Act, the Corporation has got the power of fixing the pay of its chief executive officer. Therefore we have got many precedents even under the various local Acts as also in the Government of India Act. It is therefore necessary and wise that we should follow the precedents and confer the power of fixing the pay of its chief executive officer, the vice-chancellor, upon the Senate and deciding whether the office shall be a salaried or honorary one.

"Then, there is also another important question that ought to weigh more with us. After the inauguration of the policy of appointing paid vice-chancellors, we have not been having people of outstanding capacity and merit to guide the deliberations of the Senates in any province. For instance, in place of Sir Ashutosh Mukherjee we have got Mr. Jadunath Sarcar, because of the provision of having paid vice-chancellors. What is true of Bengal is true also of all Universities in other provinces. It is therefore wise that we should leave to the Senate the whole question of fixing the pay and also deciding the occasions when and whether they could get honorary workers who may be willing to give their time to the University and restore confidence in the administration of our University which confidence alone could make beneficent donors like Palit and Rashbihary to come out with their huge savings. With these words, I very strongly support the motion of my hon. Friend."

* Mr. W. E. SMITH :—"Mr. President, I do not think this amendment can be accepted in its present form. It provides that the Senate may decide to pay its vice-chancellor or not to pay him, either at the beginning or at the end of his term of office. It will be impossible to appoint a vice-chancellor and then wait till the end of his term of office before deciding whether he should be paid or not. The object of the mover is to get an honorary vice-chancellor appointed if possible, but I do not think it can be achieved by following this particular course. That is all what I want to say, and I do not propose to enter into the merits of the question of an honorary vice-chancellor."

The hon. Dr. P. SUBBARAYAN :—"Mr. President, in the first place even though my hon. Friend there suggested that it should be in the power of the Senate to pay or not to pay its vice-chancellor, he has not suggested whether he should be a whole-time or part-time officer. I should like to point out to the House that, if the vice-chancellor is not going to be paid, we may not be able to get a suitable person. Human nature being what it is, at present it is impossible to find a whole-time officer without pay. Secondly, as the Act now stands, there is no compulsion on the Senate to pay its vice-chancellor. It only provides that the Senate may pay the vice-chancellor a salary. If they can get anybody who comes without pay, it will only be too pleased to accept the offer. For these reasons, the amendment as it stands cannot be accepted."

* Mr. C. GOPALA MENON :—"Mr. President, the Mover of the amendment has pointed out that there was a time when the work of the University was carried on by an honorary vice-chancellor. But to-day the work of the

9th October 1928]

[Mr. C. Gopala Menon]

University has very much widened and enlarged and if the administrative functions of the University are to be carried out efficiently, a paid vice-chancellor alone can do it. Otherwise the Registrar will not only be saddled with heavy work but will become all-powerful, and the honorary vice-chancellor would delegate much of the work to the Registrar. On these grounds, I oppose this amendment."

* Mr. S. SATYAMURTI:—"Sir, my sympathies are entirely with those who moved and supported this amendment. I am sure my hon. Friend, the Minister, and others who know the various distinguished men who have been honorary vice-chancellors of South Indian Universities or are paid, will agree with me that some of the most distinguished men in our public life, whether High Court Judges or distinguished educationists have rendered great service to the progress of University education in our province and elsewhere as honorary vice-chancellors. As my hon. Friend has pointed out, the name of Sir Ashutosh Mukherjee will live so long as the Calcutta University lives, and he was an honorary vice-chancellor of the Calcutta University. Confining myself for the present to our own province, I may mention among the honorary vice-chancellors who have rendered distinguished service to the University are Sir P. S. Sivaswami Ayyar, the late Sir K. Srinivasa Ayyangar, Sir John Wallis and Justice Oldfield. Three of them I had the honour of working with as vice-chancellors. One of them was vice-chancellor before I entered the Senate, and all of them I know took a keen and active interest in University affairs, devoted not less than two or three hours a day to University matters, and spent practically all their leisure time in attending to University work. I am not for one moment prepared to say that the institution of paid vice-chancellors has really improved that aspect of the vice-chancellor's work. Perhaps the purely clerical and administrative work of signing bills or receipts or checking registers is being done a little more regularly, at 11 a.m. instead of at about 4 p.m. or so. But as for giving a new orientation to our University ideals and marking mile-stones on the high road towards the ideal of higher education in the province, the new experiment has not attained unqualified success. But, Sir, I am afraid those of us who are on this side of the House have to answer the charge of the hon. the Minister that this amendment has not been given in a comprehensive form. Unfortunately, the Act, as it stands, provides, in spite of this amendment, that the vice-chancellor *shall* be a whole-time officer of the University, and although I can conceive of a possibility under which, say, for instance, a retired High Court Judge, a retired Executive Councillor or a retired Minister will be willing to come forward and be a part-time honorary vice-chancellor, I can conceive of no individual who will give his whole time statutorily to the duties of his office. Because members of the Senate like myself will then ask questions as to the hours when the vice-chancellor attends office, whether he attends office at 11 a.m. and leaves at 5 p.m., for as he is a whole-time officer, we can keep him to regular hours. But I think the Bill itself as it stands does not differ in substance from the effect of the amendment of my hon. Friend Mr. Basheer Ahmad Sayeed. The original Act provided that the vice-chancellor shall be paid such salary as may be prescribed by the statutes. The Bill now says that the officer may be paid such salary as may be prescribed by the statutes. It is open to the Senate to amend the existing statutes and say that no salary shall be paid to the vice-chancellor for the next three years. And then, if anybody is willing to come forward as a whole-time honorary vice-chancellor

[Mr. S. Satyamurti]

[9th October 1928]

there is nothing in the Bill against having such a whole-time honorary vice-chancellor. Even if my hon. Friend's amendment were carried, the effect would be that we can only have an honorary vice-chancellor, provided he is willing to work as a whole-time officer. So, I do not think it will really alter the existing position whether the amendment is passed or is not passed. But I rose merely to point out that the experiment of having paid-vice-chancellors has not been an unqualified success, and that the result of having honorary vice-chancellors has been on the whole satisfactory, especially in our province; and I sincerely hope that in Madras also we shall not give up the practice of having at least occasionally honorary vice-chancellors, provided we get good and enthusiastic men, either educationists or non-educationists who take a keen interest and enthusiastically work for the spread of University education in our province."

The amendment was put and declared carried.

A poll was demanded and the House divided thus :

1-15
p.m.

Ayes.

- | | |
|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|
| 1. Mr. Sami Venkatachalam Chetti. | 15. Mr. C. Obi Reddi. |
| 2. " S. Satyamurti. | 16. " C. Ramasomayajulu. |
| 3. " C. V. Venkataramana Ayyangar. | 17. " Basheer Ahmad Sayeed Sahib. |
| 4. " T. Adinarayana Chettiyar. | 18. " P. Bhaktavatsulu Nayudu. |
| 5. " P. Anjaneyulu. | 19. Sriman Hiswanath Das Mahasayo. |
| 6. " P. C. Venkatapathi Raju. | 20. Mr. A. Kaleswara Rao. |
| 7. " Abdul Hamid Khan. | 21. " R. Srinivasa Ayyangar. |
| 8. " C. S. Govindaraja Mudaliyar. | 22. " K. Koti Reddi. |
| 9. " G. Harisarvottama Rao. | 23. " V. Kameswara Rao Nayudu |
| 10. " C. S. Muthuranga Mudaliyar. | 24. " L. K. Tulasiram. |
| 11. " K. V. R. Swami. | 25. " C. Marudavanam Pillai. |
| 12. " D. Narayana Raju. | 26. " K. V. Krishnaswami Nayakar. |
| 13. K. Uppi Sahib Bahadur. | 27. " C. Venkatarangam Nayudu. |
| 14. Mr. K. R. Karant. | 28. " B. Venkataratnam. |

Noes.

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1. The hon. Sir. Norman Marjoribanks. | 26. Mr. A. B. Shetty. |
| 2. The hon. Khan Bahadur Sir Muhammad Usman Sahib Bahadur. | 27. " J. Bheemayya. |
| 3. " Mr. T. E. Moir. | 28. " J. A. Davis. |
| 4. " Diwan Bahadur M. Krishnan Nayar. | 29. " E. Foulkes. |
| 5. " Dr. P. Subbarayan. | 30. " P. J. Gnanavaram Pillai. |
| 6. " Mr. S. Muthiah Mudaliyar. | 31. " Mahmud Schahmad Sahib. |
| 7. Mr. W. P. A. Soundara Pandia Nadar. | 32. " Muppli Nayar of Kavalappara. |
| 8. " S. Subrahmanya Moopanan. | 33. Rao Bahadur C. V. Anantakrishna Ayyar. |
| 9. " Daniel Thomas. | 34. Mr. C. B. Cotterell. |
| 10. " S. Venkiah. | 35. " H. A. Watson. |
| 11. " Syed Ibrahim Sahib. | 36. " C. A. Souter. |
| 12. Rai Sahib M. Hampayya. | 37. " S. H. Slater. |
| 13. The Zamindar of Singampatti. | 38. " A. McG. C. Tampoe. |
| 14. Mr. F. E. Corley. | 39. " C. W. E. Cotton. |
| 15. Mr. W. E. Smith. | 40. " V. Ch. John. |
| 16. Mr. J. Kuppuswami. | 41. " M. A. Manikkavelu Nayakar. |
| 17. Subadar-Major S. A. Nanjappah Bahadur. | 42. Syed Taj-ud-din Sahib Bahadur. |
| 18. Rao Bahadur O. M. Narayanan Nam-budripad. | 43. Mr. T. C. Srinivasa Ayyangar. |
| 19. Mr. T. M. Narayanaswami Pillai. | 44. " K. R. Venkatarama Ayyar. |
| 20. " K. Krishnan. | 45. " K. P. Raman Menon. |
| 21. " N. Siva Raj. | 46. " C. Gopala Menon. |
| 22. Rao Sahib L. C. Guruswami. | 47. " B. Ramachandra Reddi. |
| 23. Mr. V. I. Muniswami Pillai. | 48. Rao Bahadur C. S. Ratnasabhpathi Mudaliyar. |
| 24. " Abdul Wahab Sahib. | 49. Khan Bahadur Khalif-ul-Jah Sahib Bahadur. |
| 25. " H. B. Ari Gowdar. | 50. Mr. G. K. Premayya. |

9th October 1928]

Noes—cont.

51. Mr. K. Ramaoahandra Padayachi.
52. Rao Sahib R. Srinivasan.
53. Rajkumar S. N. Dorai Raja.
54. Mr. S. Arpudaswami Udayar.
55. The Zamindar of Kallikota.
56. The Raja of Panagal.
57. Rao Bahadur Sir A. P. Patro.
58. Khan Bahadur S. K. Abdul Razaak Sahib Bahadur.

59. Muhammad Kadir Mohideen Sahib Bahadur.
60. Diwan Bahadur S. Kumaraswami Reddiyar.
61. Rao Bahadur B. Muniswami Nayudu.
62. Diwan Bahadur A. M. M. Murugappa Chettiyar.
63. The Zamindar of Mirzapuram.
64. Mr. A. V. Bhanoji Rao.

Ayes 28. Noes 64.

The amendment was lost.

Clause 11 was put, passed and added to the Bill.

Clause 12.

Mr. K. R. VENKATARAMA AYYAR :—"I move :

'In line 5 after the word "inserted" insert the words "the word 'at' occurring between the word 'address' and the words 'any meeting' shall be omitted".'

"In the original section as amended there are the words 'the right of addressing at the meeting'. I merely say that it should be 'addressing the meeting' for better English."

Mr. K. P. RAMAN MENON :—"I second it."

The hon. Dr. P. SUBBARAYAN :—"I have no objection to accept it."

The amendment was put and carried.

Clause 12 as amended was put, passed and added to the Bill.

Clause 13.

* Mr. BASHEER AHMAD SAYEED SAHIB :—"I move :

'In line 3, after the word "Registrar" insert the words "or Registrars".'

In line 3, omit the word "a".'

In line 4, for the word "officer" substitute the word "officers".'

"This is merely, Sir, to give facility for appointing more Registrars when the University so requires. There is one Registrar now and it may be that we may have more Registrars in course of time. In order to give power to the University to have more than one Registrar this amendment is sought to be made."

Sriman BISWANATH DAS Mahasayo :—"I second it."

The hon. Dr. P. SUBBARAYAN :—"I cannot accept this amendment because I do not think there is any necessity to have plurality of Registrars."

The amendment was put and lost.

Clause 13 was then put, passed and added to the Bill.

Clause 14.

Clause 14 was also put, passed and added to the Bill.

Clause 15.

* Mr. C. N. MUTHURANGA MUDALIYAR :—"I move :

'In line 1 of Class III, item (1), omit the word "registered".'

[Mr. C. N. Muthuranga Mudaliyar] [9th October 1928]

"Sir, I have a double object in moving this amendment. By adopting this amendment, I propose to widen the electorate for the election to the Senate. Moreover these graduates have spent a lot of money for their education, and they should not be penalised by further indirect taxation in the shape of registration fees to get themselves registered in order to qualify themselves for the electorate. So I move for the omission of this word."

Mr. P. C. VENKATAPATHI RAJU :—"I second it."

The hon. Dr. P. SUBBARAYAN :—"Mr. President, Sir, I must oppose this amendment because I feel that the electorate really becomes more unwieldy. Besides in all university bodies there is usually a limit by which members of the university can become members of the convocation. For instance in Oxford you have got to take the M.A. degree before you can exercise the franchise. I think some distinction ought to be observed because in academical bodies a little maturity of judgment is required."

* Mr. G. HARISERVOTTAMA RAO :—"I am surprised at the arguments advanced by the Chief Minister. I do not know if money matures judgment of men. Registration is a matter of money. It might have been some excuse if the franchise was restricted so as to make some revenue for the University. If there is any meaning in giving the graduates the privilege of voting, all graduates must be treated alike whether they get themselves registered or not. It should not be that there should be a premium placed on the quality of the graduates. The quality of the graduates should not be made into a quality dependent upon money. As for the custom that obtains in the older universities, there is certainly a custom that registered graduates are generally admitted to vote at elections for the university. I do not see why that particular custom should always be followed. If a large number of graduates are there coming in into the university by virtue of being the alumni, I do not see why they should be precluded from voting. I certainly feel that it would be much better to widen the electorate in these days of democracy. I therefore think that the amendment may stand."

The amendment was put and declared lost.

A poll was demanded and the House divided thus :—

1-30
p.m.

Ayes.

- | | |
|------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| 1. Rajkumar S. N. Dorai Raja. | 19. Mr. C. Ramasomayajulu. |
| 2. Mr. Sami Venkatachalam Chetti. | 20. " Basheer Ahmad Sayeed Sahib. |
| 3. " S. Satyamurti. | 21. " P. Bhaktavatsulu Nayudu. |
| 4. " C. V. Venkataramana Ayyangar. | 22. Sriman Biswanath Das Mahasayo. |
| 5. " T. Adinarayana Chettiyar. | 23. Mr. A. Kaleswara Rao. |
| 6. " P. Anjaneyulu. | 24. " R. Srinivasa Ayyangar. |
| 7. " P. C. Venkatapathi Raju. | 25. " K. Koti Reddi. |
| 8. " J. A. Saldanha. | 26. " V. Kameswara Rao Nayudu. |
| 9. " Abdul Hamid Khan. | 27. " L. K. Tulasiram. |
| 10. " C. S. Govindaraja Mudaliyar | 28. " C. Marudavanam Pillai. |
| 11. " G. Hariservottama Rao. | 29. " K. V. Krishnaswami Nayakar. |
| 12. " C. N. Muthuranga Mudaliyar. | 30. " C. Venkatarangam Nayudu. |
| 13. " K. V. R. Swami. | 31. " B. Venkataratnam. |
| 14. " D. Narayana Raju. | 32. " A. Ranganadha Mudaliyar. |
| 15. Dr. B. S. Mallayya. | 33. " Ramanath Gowda. |
| 16. Mr. K. Uppi Sahib Bahadur. | 34. " R. Nagan Gonda. |
| 17. " K. R. Karant. | 35. The Zamindar of Gollapalli. |
| 18. " C. Obi Reddi. | 36. Mr. C. R. Parthasarathi Ayyangar. |

9th October 1928]

Noes.

- | | |
|---|--|
| 1. The hon. Sir Norman Marjoribanks. | 32. Mr. S. Subrahmanya Moopnar. |
| 2. „ Khan Bahadur Sir Muhammad Usman Sahib Bahadur. | 33. „ Daniel Thomas. |
| 3. „ Mr. T. E. Moir. | 34. „ S. Venkayya. |
| 4. „ Diwan Bahadur M. Krishnan Nayar. | 35. Nattam Dubash Khadir Sahib Syed Ibrahim Sahib Bahadur. |
| 5. „ Mr. S. Muthiah Mudaliyar. | 36. Rai Sahib M. Hampayya. |
| 6. „ Dr. P. Subbarayan. | 37. The Zamindar of Singampatti. |
| 7. Mr. C. B. Cotterell. | 38. Mr. W. E. Smith. |
| 8. „ H. A. Watson. | 39. „ F. E. Corley. |
| 9. „ C. A. Souter. | 40. Khan Bahadur P. Khalif-ul-lah Sahib Bahadur. |
| 10. „ S. H. Slater. | 41. Mr. G. R. Premayya. |
| 11. „ A. McG. C. Tampoe. | 42. „ K. Ramachandra Padayachi. |
| 12. „ C. W. E. Cotton. | 43. Rao Sahib R. Srinivasan. |
| 13. „ V. Ch. John. | 44. Mr. S. Arpudaswami Udayar. |
| 14. „ M. A. Manikkavelu Nayakar. | 45. The Zamindar of Kallikota. |
| 15. Syed Tajudin Sahib Bahadur. | 46. The Raja of Panagal. |
| 16. Abdul Wahab Sahib Bahadur. | 47. Rao Bahadur Sir A. P. Patro. |
| 17. Mr. H. B. Ari Gowder. | 48. Mr. P. T. Rajan. |
| 18. „ A. B. Shetty. | 49. Khan Bahadur Abdul Razaak Sahib Bahadur. |
| 19. „ J. Bheemayya. | 50. Mahamud Kadir Mohideen Sahib Bahadur. |
| 20. „ J. A. Davis. | 51. Diwan Bahadur S. Kumaraswami Reddiyar. |
| 21. „ R. Foulkes. | 52. Rao Bahadur B. Muniswami Nayodu. |
| 22. „ Gnanavaram Pillai. | 53. Diwan Bahadur A. M. M. Marugappa Chettiyar. |
| 23. Mahmud Schammad Sahib Bahadur. | 54. Mr. A. B. Bhanoji Rao. |
| 24. Mr. J. Kuppuswami. | 55. Rao Bahadur C. S. Ratnasabapathi Mudaliyar. |
| 25. Subadar-Major S. A. Nanjappa Bahadur. | 56. Mr. B. Ramachandra Reddi. |
| 26. Rao Bahadur O. M. Narayanan Namudripad. | 57. „ C. Gopala Menon. |
| 27. Mr. T. M. Narayanaswami Pillai. | |
| 28. „ K. Krishnan. | |
| 29. „ N. Siva Raj. | |
| 30. „ V. I. Muniswami Pillai. | |
| 31. „ W. P. A. Soundara Pandia Nadar. | |

Ayes 36. Noes 57.

The amendment was lost. The House then adjourned for lunch.

After Lunch (2-30 p.m.)

V

ADJOURNMENT MOTION re SEIZURE OF COPIES OF BHARATHI'S SONGS BY THE POLICE.

* Mr. S. SATYAMURTI :—“ Mr. President, Sir, I beg leave to move that the business of this House do stand adjourned to consider a matter of urgent public importance, namely, the recent action of the City Police in entering upon and searching the premises of the Hindi Prachar Sabha on the High Road, Triplicane, for copies of Bharathi's songs, and seizing nearly two thousand copies of the same.

“ Sir, in support of this motion, I do not think I need advance elaborate or detailed arguments. For, I know, Sir, I am not exaggerating the feeling of any Member of this House who is a Tamilian, or who knows Tamil, or who is a patriot, or who is not afraid of patriotism, when I say that one wants no